



AGENDA MEMO

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: JUNE 6, 2007
DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
ITEM DESCRIPTION: GPA-20465 - APPLICANT: SW DESERT EQUITIES, LLC -
OWNER: BRAIN SURGERY, LLC, ET AL

**** CONDITIONS ****

The Planning Commission (4-3/rt/bg/ds vote) and staff recommend DENIAL.

**** STAFF REPORT ****

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This application is a request to amend a portion of the Centennial Hills Sector Plan of the Master Plan from R (Rural Density Residential) and DR (Desert Rural Density Residential) to PCD (Planned Community Development) on 23.3 acres at the southeast corner of Hualapai Way and Deer Springs Way.

The Las Vegas Master Plan 2020 stipulates projects less than 80 acres are not allowed within the PCD. Allowances may be made for infill projects; however, a 23.3 acre site in a largely undeveloped region of the city cannot be characterized as infill. Therefore, the project does not meet the intent of the General Plan, and denial of this request is recommended.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

| <i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i> | |
|---|--|
| 02/16/07 | Effective date of Annexation (ANX-12215) of 207.83 acres including the subject site. |
| 04/26/07 | The Planning Commission voted 4-3/rt/bg/ds to recommend DENIAL (PC Agenda Item #30/rl). |
| <i>Related Building Permits/Business Licenses</i> | |
| NA | |
| <i>Pre-Application Meeting</i> | |
| 03/01/07 | A pre-application meeting was held to discuss the submittal and neighborhood meeting requirements for this application. |
| <i>Neighborhood Meeting</i> | |
| 03/29/07 | <p>A neighborhood meeting was held with the surrounding property owners, per policy set forth in the city of Las Vegas application packet. Twenty-two members of the public attended, generally expressing opposition to the proposed General Plan Amendment. Concerns raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerns that apartments will be built at this site• Request for Single Family Homes only• Property values will be lowered• Request that the RNP not be changed• Construction will cause traffic issues in the area• Opposed to commercial or high density residential• Project will increase traffic in area• Opposed to change in land use and zoning |

| Details of Application Request | |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| Site Area | |
| Gross Acres | 23.3 |

| Surrounding Property | Existing Land Use | Planned Land Use | Existing Zoning |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Subject Property | Undeveloped | R (Rural Density Residential) and RNP (Rural Neighborhood Preservation) | U (Undeveloped) |
| North | Undeveloped, Clark County 215 Beltway | R (Rural Density Residential) and RNP (Rural Neighborhood Preservation) | Unincorporated Clark County R-E (Residential Estates) |
| South | Undeveloped | R (Rural Density Residential) and ROW (Right-of-Way) | Unincorporated Clark County R-E (Residential Estates) and Unincorporated Clark County Parcel Right-of-Way |
| East | Undeveloped | PCD (Planned Community Development) | PD (Planned Development) |
| West | Undeveloped | R (Rural Density Residential) and PF-CC (Public Facility – Clark County) | U (Undeveloped) and Unincorporated Clark County R-E (Residential Estates) |

| Special Districts/Zones | Yes | No | Compliance |
|---|------------|-----------|-------------------|
| Special Area Plan | | X | NA |
| Special Districts/Zones | Yes | No | Compliance |
| Special Purpose and Overlay Districts | | | |
| PCD Planned Community Development | X | | N* |
| Trails | | X | NA |
| Rural Preservation Overlay District | | X | NA |
| Development Impact Notification Assessment | | X | NA |
| Project of Regional Significance | | X | NA |

*** PCD (Planned Community Development)**

The proposed development does not meet the minimum acreage requirements of the PCD (Planned Community Development) land use designation.

ANALYSIS

The PCD (Planned Community Development) land use designation allows for a mix of residential uses that maintains an average overall density ranging from two to eight dwelling units per gross acre, depending upon compatibility with adjacent uses. This land use designation is also intended to be used for commercial, public facilities and office developments when the development is used as a buffer. The proposed development does not meet the intent of the PCD (Planned Community Development) land use designation, as the subject site is smaller than 80 acres, and the applicant has not submitted any proposals for the master development plan that is required for a Planned Community Development.

If approved; however, a master plan will be developed for the site and upon development of the individual parcels appropriate right-of-way dedications, street improvements, drainage plan/studies and traffic mitigation commitments will be required.

FINDINGS

Section 19.18.030.I of the Las Vegas Zoning Code requires that the following conditions be met in order to justify a General Plan Amendment:

1. The density and intensity of the proposed General Plan Amendment is compatible with the existing adjacent land use designations,
2. The zoning designations allowed by the proposed amendment will be compatible with the existing adjacent land uses or zoning districts,
3. There are adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed General Plan Amendment; and
4. The proposed amendment conforms to other applicable adopted plans and policies that include approved neighborhood plans.

In regard to “1”:

The proposed General Plan Amendment to PCD (Planned Community Development) gives no indication as to the proposed density or intensity of the site. A PCD at eight units per acre is not appropriate for a 23.3 acre site abutting a Rural Neighborhood Preservation district. Therefore, staff cannot support this request.

In regard to “2”:

The PD (Planned Development) zoning that would be allowed in the PCD designation would permit a density of up to eight units per acre. Staff finds a density of eight dwelling units per acre to be incompatible with the adjacent Rural Neighborhood Preservation district.

In regard to “3”:

The subject site is located at the interchange of the Bruce Woodbury Beltway (Clark County Route 215) and Hualapai Way. The parcels also abut the intersection of Hualapai Way and Deer Springs Way, a 100-foot Primary Arterial and an 80- foot Secondary Collector, respectively, on the Master Plan of Streets and Highways. However, since no specific development pattern can be discerned, it is unknown as to the ability of these streets and highways to serve the subject site.

In regard to “4”:

The applicant proposes to master plan on the subject property at a later date. Until such time as that plan is developed, conformity cannot be determined. Therefore, staff recommends denial.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED

1

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 13

SENATE DISTRICT 9

NOTICES MAILED 55 by Planning Department

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 2